



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,142	09/12/2003	Robert A. Luciano JR.	VOU-98-002-DIV.3	7741
7590 06/03/2004				
RUSS F. MARSDEN SIERRA DESIGN GROUP 300 SIERRA MANOR DRIVE RENO, NV 89511			EXAMINER NGUYEN, KIM T	
			ART UNIT 3713	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/661,142

Applicant(s)

LUCIANO, ROBERT A.

Examiner

Kim Nguyen

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/12/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment filed September 12, 2003 has been received and considered.

By this amendment, claims 1-8 are now pending in the application.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a) In claim 1, line 3; and claim 5, lines 3-4, the claimed limitation “at player terminals” should be corrected to “at the player terminals”.
 - b) In claim 1, lines 3-4; and claim 5, line 4, the claimed limitation “where player terminals” should be corrected to “where the player terminals”.
 - c) In claim 1, lines 22-23, the claimed limitation “currency dispense” should be corrected to “cash dispenser”.
 - d) In claim 5, line 9, the claimed limitation “a transaction identification” should be corrected to “the transaction identification”.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burns et al (US Patent No. 6,048,269).

a. As per claim 1, Burns discloses a cash/voucher terminal comprising player terminals 200 (Fig. 1) which accepts cashless voucher, the cashless voucher comprises a transaction identification (Fig. 3). The cash/voucher terminal comprises an enclosure 300 (Fig. 1), a cashless voucher reader 304 (Fig. 1), a cash dispenser 308 (Fig. 1); the cash/voucher terminal is configured to have no game therein (col. 3, lines 55-56), to receive and to send cashless voucher indicia to a network, to receive data from the network, and to send cash value to the cash dispenser (col. 6, lines 28-36; col. 7, lines 9-11 and 20-25). Burns does not disclose not to adapt the player terminal to accept cash, and implementing a network interface to the voucher terminal. However, Burns discloses providing a capability to accept voucher from the player terminal (col. 2, lines 52-56). Further, implementing a player terminal that does not accept cash would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to eliminate the currency slot of the player terminal of Burns, since eliminating a feature of a machine when its functionality is not needed requires only routine skill in the art. Further, since Burns teaches capability of communicating information from the voucher terminal to a host computer and since implementing a network interface for facilitating communicating data between terminals would have been well known. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement network interface

between the voucher terminal and the host CPU or other terminals in order to facilitate transferring data between computer devices.

b. As per claim 2, Burns discloses encoding the transaction identification (col. 7, lines 61-64). Further, encrypting a transaction identification would have been well known to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to encrypt the transaction identification of Burns in order to enforce security when transmitting sensitive data over network.

c. As per claim 3-4, Burns does not disclose that the transaction identification comprises at least a time derived value. However, Burns discloses generating a unique transaction identification using random number generator (col. 6, lines 23-28). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to replace the transaction identification derived from random number of Burns with the transaction identification derived from a time, since assigning a unique transaction identification in a specific format according to a designer's preference requires only routine skill in the art. Applicant in the specification page 9, lines 10-16, has admitted this obviousness.

d. As per claim 5, refer to discussion in claim 1 above. Further, Burns does not explicitly disclose a database that stores transaction identification. However, Burns discloses storing the transaction identification in association with a value (col. 6, lines 33-36). Further, using a database to maintain the transaction identification in association with a value would have been old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 3713

at the time the invention was made to replace the memory of Burns with a well known database in order to facilitate data retrieval.

e. As per claim 6-8, refer to discussion in claims 2-4 above.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-7915. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM ET.

The central official fax number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.



Kim Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3713

kn

Date: May 27, 2004